DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 266 TM 025 375

AUTHOR Veugelers, Wiel
TITLE Teaching Values and Critical Thinking.
PUB DATE Apr 96
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, April 8-12, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Processes; *Critical Thinking; Curriculum; *Ethical Instruction; Foreign Countries; Late Adolescents; Learning Strategies; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods; *Values Education; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Curricula are both the arena and the result of the struggle for hegemony in educational discourse and practice, but teachers have some freedom to give their own interpretations to the values they want to develop in their students. This paper gives examples of how teachers combine stimulating the development of specific values with teaching students to think critically. The focus is mainly on students aged 15 to 18 because this is the age in which students' identities begin to manifest themselves more obviously than at younger ages, and this is the last phase in which students can be socialized through education. Values related to labor provide an example of the way teachers can develop values in their students, whether they teach in the regular educational system or in the vocational education sector. Central to the critical thinking approach to education is that students analyze their own points of view and the viewpoints of others for value orientations. Teachers may be expected to adopt a neutral attitude toward the values concerned. However, in the interaction between students and teachers it is not possible for the teacher not to express certain values. Research has suggested that combining critical thinking and values education approaches is possible if teachers teach cognitive strategies, stimulate specific values as part of the pedagogical task, and still show respect for students' own opinions. (Contains 41 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

TEACHING VALUES AND CRITICAL THINKING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WIEL VEUGELERS

UNIVERSITY of AMSTERDAM

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
WIEL VEUGELERS
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Paper presented on the AERA-conference
NEW YORK, April 1996

ED 398 266

Introduction/Summary

Education has a pedagogical task, which means that education intends to develop values in students. Education contributes to the identity construction of youngsters. This task stems from the role played by education in socializing youth, in order to help them function in society. For what kind of society students will be prepared is partly laid down in curricula. These curricula are both the arena and the result of a struggle for hegemony in educational discourse and practice. But each school, and all teachers have some freedom to give their own interpretation to the values they want to develop in their students. Teachers are the ones who shape the pedagogical task. A teacher tries to stimulate the development of specific values in his/her students. But teachers also want students to acquire skills that enable them to think critically, that is, analyze various opinions on their value orientation. In this article we give examples of how teachers combine stimulating the development of specific values with teaching students to think critically.

Dr. WIEL VEUGELERS
UNIVERSITY of AMSTERDAM
GRADUATE SCHOOL of TEACHING AND LEARNING
FACULTY of EDUCATIONAL STUDIES
Wibautstraat 4
1091 GM AMSTERDAM
the NETHERLANDS
Tel. 31 20 525 1370
Fax 31 20 525 1270
E-mail WIEL@ NAS.EDUC.UVA.NL

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM025375

Value stimulation by teachers

From a sociological point of view (Apple, 1986) teachers cannot adopt a neutral attitude toward certain values. They always stimulate values they consider important for their students. They always try to stimulate the development of specific values in their students. The values teachers find important for their students are expressed in the content of their instruction and in the way they guide the learning process. The values a teacher wishes to develop in his/her students are expressed in the pedagogical content knowledge of that teacher (Gudmundsdottir, 1990), in his or her interpretation of the curriculum (Goodlad, Klein and Tye 1979). Teachers stimulate these values via subject matter, chosen examples and reactions to their students. Teachers can express values implicitly, in the hidden curriculum (Giroux and Purpel, 1983) but, by means of reflection, they can also be explicit about the values they express and the way they express them (Liston and Zeichner, 1991).

Constructivism paradigm in cognitive psychology states that students develop their own knowledge and insights (Grennan Brooks and Brooks, 1993; Prawatt, 1992). Students accommodate and assimilate the received knowledge and insights in their own structures of knowledge. Students design their own signification of meaning. A teacher tries to influence this process of signification of meaning by providing a content and, in particular, by his/her interaction with the students. In education, a comparable teaching strategy is used when attention is given to the development of values. Students develop their own values, they give their own signification of meaning, but teachers try to influence this process of signification (McLaren, 1994; Veugelers, 1989). By doing this, teachers stimulate the development of specific values. Therefore we use the term 'value stimulation' (Veugelers, 1993).

In our opinion it is useful to make a clear distinction between teachers and students activities, that is, instruction and learning. Students construct their own values in their learning. Teachers try to help students in this process, but in this they do not function neutrally. They try to stimulate the construction of specific values. In their interaction with students, teachers want to stimulate the development of specific values, whereas students have to react to these values.

In describing the role of education in the development of certain values, most people use the concept 'transfer of values'. According to this concept, education should transmit certain values to students, this suggesting that values can be passed on. But both constructive psychology and critical pedagogy (Giroux, 1989) show that teachers cannot transfer values to their students, because students construct their own concepts of meaning and develop their own values. Teachers, however, can encourage students to develop certain values. They can try to influence the development of certain values by their students. Teachers can be asked which values they want to develop in their students, which values they propagate by means of didactic materials and educational

behavior and how they work on stimulating the development of values in students. Of course we cannot make the whole 'hidden curriculum' explicit, but that is no excuse for not analyzing the values teachers find important for their students and how teachers work with these values in their educational practice.

Pedagogical task of education

In the Netherlands, like in most Western countries, the pedagogical task of education has been stressed once more recently in mainstream educational discourse (Edwards, Munn and Fogelman, 1994). In the Netherlands, for instance, this has been done by politicians, educational scientists and pedagogues. For teachers the pedagogical task of education means not only that they must pay attention to the development of values, but also that they must develop specific values. This emphasis on the pedagogical task of education is the result of a shift in educational discourse occurring in the eighties. According to conservative critics, the emphasis on personal development and sociocultural education in the sixties and the seventies undervalued the acquisition of knowledge and skills in education. The 'back-to-basic' movement stressed therefore the importance of acquiring knowledge and skills. In the nineties, another shift has been occurring in mainstream educational discourse. According to the policy pursued by most Western European countries and by the United States education should, once again, enhance its pedagogical task. Education has to contribute overtly to the reproduction of society, it has to integrate youngsters in the system.

Before, progressive educators have been accused of using education as a political tool for transforming society. Now, conservative critics ply for a political project too. As we will show further down in this article, in our opinion there is no teaching possible without working on value development. So, the question is not whether teachers are working on the pedagogical task of education, but in what kind of sociopolitical project?

TEACHERS AND THE CURRICULUM

In analyzing the pedagogical tasks of teachers in education we use the levels distinguished in the curriculum by Goodlad, Klein and Tye (1979). On the national political level, the level of 'ideal curriculum' as Goodlad calls it, the pedagogical task of education means stimulating the commitment to society viewed as a community, to values which are accepted by the whole society. On the level of 'formal' curriculum one speaks of values like cooperation/solidarity/caring, equal rights/no-discrimination and concern for life and environment. Comparable lists of values can be found in

American publications (see, for instance, Huffman, 1994). This kind of lists look quite similar, yet there are important differentiations in the formulation: they can be part of different sociopolitical projects. On this level of curriculum one notices differences, especially in the relation between individual interests and more social or collective responsibilities. In the Netherlands, probably as result of a long tradition of social-democratic and christian-democratic policy, there is, in our opinion, more concern for cooperation, solidarity and social responsibilities than in the United States. But probably the similarities between both societies are greater than the coherence inside each society.

The values formulated at the level of 'formal curriculum' must be interpreted by each school, in accordance with their own school identity. At the level of teaching process, within the framework of school culture, a teacher gives a more concrete interpretation of the pedagogical task on the political- and school level. At the distinguished levels there are always possibilities for differentiation in signification. When values become part of the educational practice, significations can really show clear differences.

Teacher, power and assessment

In education, teachers have a great influence on the assessment of their students (Hargreaves, 1989). Because of this judging role of teachers there cannot be a power-free value communication between teachers and students, in which participants get involved in an equal way of communicating about values. Teachers may try to reduce the influence of sanctions in this communication, but the formal inequality in power between teachers and students remains. Students are more or less 'pressured' to consider the values that are stimulated by the teachers. Students have to consider these values in their own process of signification. Due to the formal power relations between teachers and students, the latter must make up their own mind about the values the teacher stimulates.

TEACHERS AND VALUES REGARDING LABOR

The values teachers wish to stimulate and the way in which they handle different values in their teaching are influenced by their view on education and didactic activities, but also by the age of their students. We are mainly interested in the age group 15-18 year olds, an age when the development of youngsters' identity begins to manifest itself more obviously. Moreover, this is the last phase in which all students can be socialized via education.

What values teachers want to stimulate will be showed here. We take the

example of values regarding labor. Education has the tasks of 'personal development' 'sociocultural education', and 'socioeconomic preparation'. These tasks can be distinguished only analytically. In educational practice they go together. The preparation of students for labor goes together with their preparation for society. By preparing students for labor a contribution is also made to their personal development. In preparing students for labor, teachers want to develop qualifications for labor. With regard to the required qualifications for labor, a distinction can be made between technical-instrumental and social-normative qualifications. Social-normative qualifications are the values and habits people need for labor. Hurrelmann (1975) divides the social-normative qualification for labor in social-regulative, motivational-normative and politico-normative elements.

In one of our studies, the motivational-normative and politico-normative elements were discerned in the following themes: 'motives in occupational choice', 'social organization of labor' (division of labor and unemployment) 'labor relations' and 'relations between education and labor' (Veugelers, 1993). A social-normative qualification for labor could be aimed at personal adaptation, personal emancipation and collective emancipation (See for similar positions, Carnoy and Levin, 1985 and Simon, Dippo and Schenke, 1991).

This study was achieved by means of a written questionnaire filled out by 415 teachers in general secondary education and vocational education, the response-rate was 60%. It shows which values and value orientations teachers wish to develop in their students. Furthermore, teachers had to answer why they had chosen these goals. Both general and vocational education have to concentrate on education for work (Kincheloe, 1995). All different school types for the age group 16-18 where included in the research. School subjects comprised economics and practical subjects, social studies and career counselling (see for more details on methods and results, Veugelers 1995a and 1995b).

Results show that teachers do not only pass knowledge and skills onto their students, but they also stimulate them in developing certain values related to labor. The personal curriculum used by teachers, their interpretation of the formal curriculum includes goals related to the development of values related to labor. Teachers want to transfer specific values that are part of their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. Teachers' professional view is that they have a pedagogical task. Results show that the type of school, the subject, personal characteristics, as well as the culture of the school, have an influence on the specific values teachers stimulate in their students. They also show that teachers in their interpretation of the formal curriculum include goals related to the development of values related to labor. Teachers want to transfer specific values that are part of their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. Teachers' professional view is that they have a pedagogical task.

Personal adaptation, personal emancipation and collective emancipation

Our investigation shows that teachers declare that they attach more importance to goals related to collective emancipation than to those related to adjustment. This is obvious in the theme dedicated to 'social organization of labor', which is oriented towards the labor system. Concerning 'labor relations' the difference between collective emancipation and adjustment has proved to be smaller. Furthermore, teachers find it important that their students acquire both values related to adjustment and values related to changing the existing labor relations by endeavoring to achieve a more equal division of labor. Orientation towards adjustment as elaborated in this study appears mainly in the theme dedicated to 'relations between education and labor'. Teachers stimulate in their students the development of the view that personal attitudes and initiatives have an influence on future achievements in professional career. They also stimulate the view that labor relations such as rights and duties, for instance, are present in school.

Teachers in both general and vocational educational institutions attach much importance to political-normative elements, such as 'motives in occupational choice' 'division of labor' and 'unemployment'. Differences between teachers in general educational institutions and those in vocational institutions are mainly expressed by the importance teachers in vocational institutions attach to goals related to the organization of labor and the relations existing between education and labor, in this case, legitimizing selection and allocation in education and work. For teachers in general secondary schools their pedagogical task regarding labor means providing students with an orientation about the place labor takes in society and the place it can take in one's life. For teachers in vocational education this pedagogical task also involves preparing students for performance in the work situation and stimulating them to develop values that enable them to adjust to their work environment and feel responsible for their own performance in this environment.

Teachers in the apprenticeship system and in short senior secondary vocational courses (*kmbo*) preparing students for lower qualifications score higher on the cluster dedicated to 'equal division of labor' than teachers in senior secondary commercial education (*meao*), senior general secondary education (*havo*) and upper secondary education (*vwo*), preparing students for average and high-level positions. The same pattern can be noticed in the cluster allocated to 'discipline' as an influential factor in future achievement. Teachers in *kmbo* and the apprenticeship system are both oriented towards individual/collective emancipation and adjustment, especially adjustment to labor relations. Teachers in general education, in *havo* and, even more often, in *vwo* are strongly oriented toward individual emancipation.

The results show that school type, school subject, personal characteristics and school culture influence the values teachers stimulate in their students. It also shows that teachers in different schooltypes in the Netherlands want to construct another identity.

An identity that corresponds with reproducing social relations in society. But teachers are not only working on adjustment, they also want to stimulate the development of a collective emancipation. For teachers in the Netherlands, their pedagogical task regarding labor includes working on changing labor relations in the direction of more equality. In choosing their educational goals, not only the subject they teach is important but teachers personal characteristics too. Teachers' choice is also shaped by the culture of the school.

CRITICAL THINKING

Our research shows that teachers want to develop specific values in their students. The 'critical thinking' movement advocates a totally different approach in working with values. Central in their way of working with values is that students analyze their own point of view and the view points of other people on the value orientation bound to these points of view. Important exponents of the 'critical thinking' movement are Ennis (1994) and Paul (1992). In these didactic approaches teachers' functioning is considered to be value-neutral. In this approach the teacher tries to fit his or her students out with certain skills that enable them to explain certain values, communicate them, and make logical analyses of the various opinions. In these didactic approaches teachers are expected to adopt a neutral attitude toward the values concerned.

Also, in a great deal of educational approaches to moral development, it is assumed that teachers are only structuring the learning process of their students, and that they will function in a value-neutral way, for example in 'value clarification' (Raths, Harmin and Simon, 1966). The work of Kohlberg (See Oser, 1994; Power, Higgins and Kohlberg, 1991), in which students are taught to develop their own values based on the analysis of dilemmas is also a way of teaching students to think critically. In this article we will concentrate on 'critical thinking' literature.

In their review article, Kennedy, Fisher and Ennis (1991) distinguish the following skills for 'critical thinking': identifying assumptions, both stated and unstated, both one's own and others'; clarifying, focusing, and remaining relevant to the topic; understanding logics and judging sources, their reliability and credibility. Besides skills, dispositions are important too: being open-minded; considerate of our people; being impartial; suspending judgement; taking a stance when warranted; questioning one's own view and using one's critical thinking skills. Speaking of the 'critical movement', Ennis (1994) says that it is not in the first place a fixed curriculum used in many schools, but more a set of educational notions incorporated in the curriculum and in the pedagogical actions of teachers.

Criticizing 'critical thinking'

The criticism toward the 'critical thinking' movement is twofold: first it strongly appeals to a cognitive learning style (Kaplan 1991; Thayer-Bacon, 1993). The increase of care and commitment to the subject is inadequately incorporated in the conceptual framework of teaching 'critical thinking'. Another point of criticism is that 'critical thinking' stimulates relativism. Teachers do not explicitly express the values they find important for their students. Students get the impression that all values are of equal worth. This apparently value-neutral position of the teacher in teaching 'critical thinking' looks necessary in that framework, as students learn to formulate their own point of view. According to these critics, the effect is that students learn that view points are value-bound, but that because of the 'neutral' position of the teacher, they obtain no indications about what is 'good' and what is 'bad' (Sockett, 1992). This criticism comes mostly from people like Bloom (1987), who are concerned about the lost of traditional values.

A sociopolitical practice

From a more liberal position, a reference is made to the postmodern age in which we are presently living. According to postmodernism, in the present society there are no longer any fixed values, traditional ideologies have lost their coherence and also, partly, their signification (Autio, Jaakkola and Ropo, 1994; Usher and Edwards, 1993). This postmodernist criticism could be right in that traditional ideologies are not that powerful anymore. In our opinion, this does not mean that education does not have a pedagogical task anymore (see also, Beyer and Liston, 1992). Kincheloe (1995) says that the social commitment of the critical has to interplay with the radical uncertainty of the postmodern.

Students still have to be socialized for the community. Society uses its socialization institutions to incorporate new members as part of the existing cultural politics. Education is still a powerful institution. Perhaps, the developments occurring in our society nowadays are less pre-determined than before, yet, our society reproduces and transforms itself. This process of reproduction and transformation represents both the inset and the effect of political and cultural struggle. In education, this struggle is reflected in the curriculum, in the educational goals of teachers and in educational practice (Giroux and Mc Laren, 1989). Teachers are part of this political and cultural struggle. As cultural politics, education implies not only the transfer of knowledge and the development of skills, but also the development of values. When in developing the citizenship of their students teachers cannot remain neutral in this political and cultural struggle. Thus, 'critical thinking implies not only reading the word, but also reading the

world' (Goodman, 1992, p. 159).

Recently, Walters (1994) has analyzed the development of the critical thinking movement. The 'first wave' of critical thinkers focused on logical analysis, whereas the 'second wave' focused on the ideological position of the thinker, i.e., critical thinking was understood contextually. McLaren (1994) argues for a 'third wave' which sees reasoning as a sociopolitical practice, as part of politics of social justice. Value stimulation by teachers is always a sociopolitical practice, it depends on the political position of the teacher if they contribute to social justice.

Beyond value-neutrality

Beside the points of criticism referring to cognitivism and relativism, we would like to add another point. This point was actually indicated in the beginning. Teachers cannot use a value-neutral way of teaching. In the interaction between teacher and student it is not possible for the teacher not to express certain values. Teachers express values in the selected curriculum documents, in the chosen examples and in their reaction to their students. Realizing that teachers express certain values also makes it possible to think about the way in which teachers use these values in teaching, and which values they find important for their students. We think it is necessary to de-mystify this so-called value-neutral thinking in describing teachers' work. This way of thinking is still very strong in educational studies, representing an expression of technological rationality (Veugelers, 1989).

Both 'critical thinking' and 'moral development' consist of notions related to students' learning activities, with the characteristic that a student develops his/her own values. Because both movements promote a value-neutral position for the teacher in pedagogical action in these theoretical positions, there is in our opinion, not enough focus on the values teachers find important for their students, on the way teachers express these values and, for interaction, on the value-level between teacher and student. In the last part of the article we will give some examples of interaction between teacher and student.

VALUE STIMULATION AND 'CRITICAL THINKING'

The first study about 'values and labor' showed that teachers want to stimulate the development of specific values, but what is their methodology and their didactic approach? We are particularly interested in learning processes in which students are challenged to construct in an active way values, their own points of view. For that purpose we shall concentrate on teachers' role in combining teaching cognitive

strategies for critical thinking and stimulating, as part of their pedagogical task, the development of specific values.

Learning 'critical thinking' and developing values by students

Let us first look at the learning process. In learning critical thinking students can acquire cognitive strategies for signification and they can also learn to regulate these learning processes. Learning to think critically can be seen as a higher-order thinking in the development of values. Judging the information is a central feature in this process. Kennedy, Fisher and Ennis (1991) and Paul (1992) made long lists of cognitive strategies needed for critical thinking. As we are interested in the influence values have on 'critical' thinking we selected some specific cognitive strategies. We also added strategies for dialogue, because participating in a dialogue is a strong mean in the process of learning critical thinking (Shor, 1992). So, we obtained the following reformulated cognitive strategies, which are part of the learning process for 'critical' thinking:

1 formulate one's own opinion
2 analyze which values are expressed in that opinion
3 formulate other opinions about the same topic, and analyze which values are expressed in other opinions
4 compare different opinions and the values expressed in them
5 have a dialogue about the opinions of others
6 have a dialogue about one's own opinion

Learning 'critical thinking' and value stimulation by teachers

When teachers teach students these cognitive strategies they also try to influence the development of values by their students. Teachers cannot teach these strategies in a value-neutral way. For example, a teacher asks his/her students which are the causes of unemployment (to explore values/points of view). Subsequently, the teacher asks which view on the relation between individuals and society is grounded in each cause (to analyze values on their value-orientation). Then the teacher asks which are the criteria used by the student and by other people in opting for a certain value-orientation (to make explicit and compare criteria).

With all the mentioned cognitive strategies, the values teachers want to develop in their students become clear. For instance, when exploring, a teacher mentions causes his/her student has not mentioned yet. Especially the causes found important by the

teacher are expressed. A comparable process takes place in analyzing values on their orientation. The teacher indicates orientations that were not mentioned by the students, pointing to so-called 'logical' failings in the analysis, and shows implicitly (and sometimes explicitly) which analyses and values he or she appreciates. In making values explicit and the comparing criteria teachers cannot function in a value-neutral way either.

A model for pedagogical action

Most of the times, teachers will show the values they find important for their students implicitly. In their content of instruction, personal curriculum and didactic methods teachers express the values they find important. However, teachers can also work more explicitly on value-stimulation by stimulating quite clearly and overtly certain values. In their educational practice, in dealing with the development of values, teachers will concentrate on teaching cognitive strategies, strategies for critical thinking. But even then, teachers will show which values they find important for their students. The cognitive strategies teachers want to teach to their students are 'colored' by the values they find important for their students.

We distinguish four instruction strategies in teaching value-loaded topics:

A the teacher tries not to express his own values
B the teacher makes explicit the values he/she finds important
C the teacher stresses differences in values without expressing the values he/she finds important
D the teacher indicates differences in values, but also expresses the values he/she finds important

This does not mean that students have to adopt these values, but due to power relations in education, students have to approach these values in a serious way. Students have to make up their mind about the values their teachers stimulate.

Research on learning critical thinking and value stimulation

A second study examines more directly the connection between stimulating certain values by teachers and students' learning how to be critical. Teachers from five schools of upper secondary education participate now in the first qualitative stage of this study. In their curriculum they all want to work on what Mc Laren (1994) calls a sociopolitical

practice as part of politics of social justice. Interviews with these teachers were mainly focused on teachers' voices about the way they see their task in developing certain values in their students. In their reports on educational practice teachers have to indicate which of the above- mentioned cognitive strategies they teach and in which way values are expressed in their teaching. They have to describe their educational practice and their students' behavior, and particularly their interaction with the students.

Different ways of expressing values

We shall now give some examples showing how the teachers participating in our study descibe the way in which they express their values when teaching cognitive strategies for critical thinking. Here are some examples of strategies used by teachers:

The teacher tries not to express his own values

> 'In the educational program there is a discussion about opinions like "you live for working or you live for living". In groups, students have to think about these opinions and search arguments that underlie the opinions. As a teacher I listen and look if the arguments fit the opinion. It is my choice not to intervene. My values are already often implicitly and explicitly part of the curriculum.'

This teacher does not want to express his own values now (strategy A), but he is aware of the fact that he already often expresses his values and that, in general, students know what his opinion is. When analyzing this episode the teacher admitted that although he was just judging the quality of the arguments this judgement was not an objective way of assessment, but a subjective one. For example, is the quality of the arguments provided by those who are *for* a new highway better than the *con* arguments? The quality can only be judged when these arguments are assessed in the context of a value orientation.

Pattern in instructional strategies
Some teachers affirm that there is a pattern in the way they use instructional strategies when teaching value-loaded topics: they mostly start by

- not expressing their own values (strategy A)

then

- stress differences in values without expressing the values they find important (strategy C)

and end with

- the values they find important (strategy D).

They start this pattern by avoiding to express certain values in order to give students the opportunity to formulate their own opinions, then they want to be sure that different opinions are taken into consideration. They end by indicating the values they find important themselves.

The teacher indicates differences in values, but also expresses the values he/ she finds important

Another noticed strategy is that teachers confront students with certain values they find important for them. Students are invited to express their own points of view about those opinions/values (strategy D). Two examples:

'We are now talking about choosing a continuing study in higher education. A student said "I want to become a historian, but there are not enough jobs, so I don't choose this study". As a teacher I did not agree with this opinion. I asked the other students "What do you think about this opinion?'

and

'I point out the contradiction, and often I give my own opinion to the students asking them to come with their own points of view about my opinion next week. For example, I told a student that I thought he would become a good teacher. I asked him to think about it and give me all his pros and cons. Students find me very confronting. They appreciate this, but you can only do this when there is a good atmosphere between teacher and students.'

More teachers say that they are quite clear in expressing their opinions and ask students to use cognitive strategies for 'critical' thinking in formulating their own opinions. In using these strategies they have to react to the opinion of the teacher.

Stimulating values and continuing the dialogue

Teachers must teach students cognitive strategies, stimulate specific values as part of their pedagogical task and, at the same time, they must show some respect for students' own opinions in consideration of the students' feeling of self-respect and of teachers' acceptance of cultural differences. The balance between these three educational tasks is not easy for teachers. Some examples:

- 'You are continuously pushing, in a really personal way. You watch and take care of the limits of your interventions.'
- 'In the values of others you look for some space that is open for change. These values sometimes clash with your own values. You try to make opinions debatable and, at the same time, respect others' opinions.'
- The approach is to try to respect values, but also to be clear in what you think, the most important thing is to keep the dialogue open.'

LEARNING CRITICAL THINKING AS PART OF A SOCIOPOLITICAL PROJECT

In the interaction of values in the classroom teachers act both as supervisors and participants. They pay their own contribution to the content. But because of their pedagogic authority this contribution cannot be compared to that of their students (Lisman, 1991; Van Manen, 1994). Teachers have a greater influence on the curriculum. Their values are ingrained in educational matters and also in the pedagogical relations which, together, constitute the concept of education. As we have seen, teachers cannot remain neutral with regard to expressing certain values in their teaching. Stimulating certain values is characteristic of their profession. Therefore, we think, it is advisable to be aware of the values teachers want to develop in their students. For teachers this means that they have to make more explicit which values are included in their 'pedagogical content knowledge'. In considering their work teachers should not only reflect upon their interaction with the students, but also upon the values that govern their teaching), they have to develop their sociopolitical project (Liston and Zeichner, 1992; Veugelers and. Zijlstra, 1995).

In teaching their students critical thinking skills, teachers do not take up a neutral position, but here also they stimulate certain values. Therefore, we think it is important to examine what teachers do when they try to develop critical thinking skills in their students, at the same time wishing to develop certain values. In one and the same process teachers try to continue the dialogue with their students and to change certain values.

Giroux (1995) states that all teaching is profoundly political and that critical educators should operate out of a project of social transformation. Giroux makes clear what the difference is between critical educators and conservatives, the latter refuse to examine their own values, beliefs, and ideological construction. Therefore, when teachers combine value stimulation with critical thinking they also have to analyze their own opinions and values. Their own values are part of the game of signification. But the teacher is just one of the players.

REFERENCES

Apple, M.W. (1986) *Teachers and texts* (New York, Routledge and Kegan).

Autio, T. Jaakkola, R. and Ropo, E. (1994) Postmodern Order and a Curriculum, From Transmission toTransformation. Paper presented at the *ECUNET-conference*, August1994, Enschede, the Netherlands.

Beyer, L.E. and Liston, D.P. (1992), Disourse or Moral Action, A Critique of Postmodernism, in: *Educational Theory*, 42, nr.4, pp. 371-393.

Bloom, A. (1987) The closing of the American mind (New York, Simon and Schuster).

Carnoy, M. and Levin, H.M. (1985) *Schooling and work in the democratic state*. (Stanford, Stanford University Press).

Edwards, L., Munn, P. and Fogelman, K. (1994) *Education for citizenship* (Lisse, Swets and Zeitlinger).

Ennis, R.H. (1994) Critical Thinking Dispositions: Theoretical and Practical Considerations in their Delineation, Endorsement, and Assessment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, New Orleans, April 1994.

Giroux, H.A. (1989) *Schooling for democracy* (Londen, Routledge).

Giroux, H.A. (1995) Teaching in the Age of 'Political Correctness, in: *The Educational Forum*, 59, pp. 130-139.

Giroux, H.A. and McLaren, P.L. (eds.) (1989) *Critical pedagogy, the state and cultural struggle* (New York, Suny).

Giroux, H.A., and Purpel, D. (1983) *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*. (Berkeley, McCutchan).

Goodlad, J.I., Klein, M.F. and Tye, K.A. (1979) The Domains of Curriculum and their Study, in: J.I.Goodlad (eds.) *Curriculum Inquiry* (New York, McGraw-Hill).

Goodman, J. (1992) Elementary Schooling for Critical Democracy (New York, Suny).

Grennan Brooks, J. and Brooks, M.G. (1993) *In Search of Understanding, The Case for Constructivist Classrooms* (ASCD, Alexandria).

Gudmundsdottir, S. (1990) Values in Pedagogical Content Knowledge, in: *Journal of Teacher Education*, 3, pp. 44-52.

Hargreaves, A. (1989) *Curriculum and Assessment Reform* (Milton Keynes, Open University Press).

Huffman, H.A. (1994) *Developing a Character Education Program* (ASCD, Alexandria).

Hurrelmann, K. (1975) *Erziehungssystem und Gesellschaft* (Reinbeck, Rowohlt).

Kaplan, L.D. (1991) The Failure of the Critical Thinking Movement, in: *Educational Theory, 4*, pp. 361-370.

Kennedy, M., Fisher, M.B. and Ennis, R.H. (1991) Critical Thinking: Literature Review and Needed Research, in: Idol, L and Fly Jones, B. (eds.) *Educational Values and Cognitive Instruction: Implicaties for reform* (Hilsdale, Lawrence Erlbaum).

Kincheloe, J.L. (1995) *Toil and Trouble. Good work, smart workers, and the integration of academic and vocational education* (New York, Peter Lang).

Lisman, C.D. (1991) A Critical Review of the Moral Dimensions of Teaching, in: *Educational Theory*, 2, pp. 227-234.

Liston, D.P, and Zeichner, K.M. (1991) *Teacher Education and the Social Conditions of Schooling* (New York, Routledge).

Manen, M. van (1994) Pedagogy, Virtue and Narrative Identity in Education, in: *Curriculum Inquiry*, vol. 24, nr. 2.

Marzano, R.J. (1992) *A Different Kind of Classroom. Teaching with dimensions of lear ning (ASCD, Alexandria).*

McLaren, P.L. (1994) Foreword: Critical Thinking as a Political Project, in: Walters, K.S. *Re-Thinking Reason, New Perspectives in Critical Thinking*. (Albany, State Unuversity of New York Press).

Oser, F.K. (1994) Moral Perspectives on Teaching. In: *Review of Research in Education*, 20, pp. 57-128.

Paul, R.W. (1992) *Critical Thinking, What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World* (Santa Rosa, The Foundation for Critical Thinking).

Power, F.C., Higgins, A. and Kohlberg, L. *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education* (New York, Columbia University Press).

Prawatt, J. (1992) Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching and Learning: a Constructivist Perspective, in: *American Journal of Education*, 100, pp. 354-395.

Raths, L., Harmin, M. and Simon, S. (1966) *Values and Teaching* (Ohio, Columbus).

Simon, R.I., Dippo, D. and Schenke, A. (1991) *Learning Work: A Critical Pedagogy of Work Education* (New York, Bergin & Garvey).

Shor, I. (1992) *Empowering Education. Critical Teaching for Social Change* (Chicago, University of Chicago Press).

Sockett, H. (1992) The Moral Aspects of the Curriculum, in: Jackson, P.W., eds. *Handbook of Research on Curriculum*. (New York, MacMillan) pp. 543-569.

Usher R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and Education* (London, Routledge).

Thayer-Bacon, B.J. (1993) Caring and its Relation to Critical Thinking, in: *Educational Theory*, 43, 3, pp. 323-340.

Veugelers, W. (1989) The Modular Approach in the Netherlands, Rationalities in the Relationship between Education and Labor, in: Voorbach, J.T. and Prick, L.G.M., *Teacher Education 5. Research and Developments on Teacher Education in the Netherlands* ('s Gravenhage, SVO).

Veugelers, W. (1993) *Pedagogische Opdracht en Arbeid* (Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers).

Veugelers, W. (1995a) Teachers and Value regarding Labour, in: *Curriculum Studies*, 2, 3, pp. 169-182.

Veugelers, W. (1995b) Vocational Education and Values regarding Labor. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the *American Educational Research Association*, San Francisco, April 1995.

Veugelers, W. and Zijlstra, H. (1995). Learning Together: In-Service Education in Networks of Schools, in: *British Journal of In-Service Education*, 21, 1, pp. 37-48.